REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 13-17, 20-22, 24 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 24 and 25 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-4, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey et al. (US 5,703,655) (hereinafter "Corey") in view of Chen (US 2002/0136538) (hereinafter "Chen").

Claims 6, 7, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of Chen and further in view of Jain et al. (US 6,360,234) (hereinafter "Jain").

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of Chen and further in view of Thomas et al. (US 6,847,395) (hereinafter "Thomas").

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of Chen and further in view of Strubble et al. (US 5,483,278) (hereinafter "Strubble").

Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 33

Amended claim 1 recites: "...wherein selecting the category item for the A/V signal comprises comparing feature information of the A/V signal with predetermined category items."

The Office Action relies on Corey to show this feature of claim 1. In particular, the Examiner relies on the descriptor discussed in Corey to correspond to the feature information recited in claim 1. However, as discussed at 5:53-5:57 of Corey, the descriptor designates that the formatted closed caption data following this line is, for example, the Channel 9 news that was broadcast between 5:00-6:00 p.m. on Sep. 2, 1994, and the compressed video data is stored in "i:9n9-2.mpg." Corey, 5:53-5:57. It is further respectfully submitted that the descriptor of Corey does not correspond to the feature information of claim 1 because the descriptor of Corey are query terms rather than feature information that may be divided into categories.

The Office Action further relies on 10:5-10:18 of Corey which discusses the retrieval services for retrieval by title and headline. In Corey, there is a title indexing area and a headline indexing area which are stored on the closed caption storage 72. The indexing information for each of these two services is partioned into categories such that, in step 520, a category may be chosen prior to choosing a particular requested title or headline. For instance, in one preferred embodiment the titles for video programming are categorized into categories such as movies,

sports, entertainment, national news and local news. Thus, in step 520 these categories may be displayed on monitor 84, so that the user may select the desired category via steps 524 and 528 and subsequently have the requested video program retrieved and displayed on the monitor 84 as indicated by step 532. Corey, 10:5-10:18.

However, it is respectfully submitted that this section of Corey is related to **video programming retrieval**, whereas the present invention recites a method of **recording** an audio/video (A/V) signal. In Corey, when A/V signals are recorded to the video/audio storage, only index information is saved that may be categorized.

By contrast, claim 1 recites a method where a category item for the A/V signal is selected, and then A/V signal is recorded based on the category.

More particularly, claim 1 discloses a technical feature of selecting a category item for the A/V signal **when recording the A/V signal**. In contrast, 10:5-10:18 and the abstract of Corey discuss the retrieval services **retrieving segments of stored video programs** by title and headline.

Specifically, 10:5-10:18 of Corey discusses a technical feature that **a category may be chosen prior to choosing a particular requested title or headline**, categories may be displayed on the monitor 84 so that a user may select the desired category and subsequently have the requested **video program retrieved** and displayed on the monitor 84. That is, 10:5-10:18 of Corey discloses a technical feature of choosing a category **for retrieving a video program** and does not disclose a technical feature of selecting a category item for the A/V signal when recording the A/V signal.

In addition, independent claim 1 of the present application discloses a technical feature of storing category information about the A/V signal, the category information including the category item. In contrast, 4:31-4:34 of Corey discloses **only** that a closed caption storage 72 stores **index records** and does not disclose the category information including the category item as recited in claim 1.

Still further, claim 1 recites that the category item for the A/V signal is selected by comparing feature information of the A/V signal with predetermined category items. In contrast, 5:45-5:57 of Corey discloses the descriptor obtained using the command illustrated in Figure 6, the descriptor includes command text 700 as shown in Figure 7 and a location 704 as shown in Figure 7, the command text 700 identifies the video program from which the closed caption data is obtained, the location 704 is a location of the audio and video data stored on the video/audio

storage 40. Thus, the descriptor designates that the formatted closed caption data is for Channel 9 news that was broadcasted between 5:00-6:00 p.m. on Sep. 2, 1994 and the video data is stored in "i:9m9-2.mpg". However, 5:45-5:57 of Corey **does not disclose that the descriptor can be used to select the category item for the A/V signal.** Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the descriptor in Corey is not used to select the category item for the A/V signal.

In addition, 10:5-10:28 of Corey discloses technical features regarding the headline retrieval service and title retrieval service using a category, and does not disclose a technical feature of selecting the category item for the A/V signal by comparing feature information of the A/V signal with predetermined category items.

Furthermore, 2:5-2:29 of Corey discloses that a query is compared to the index text records of the video index records so that **the desired video segments may be located and retrieved. The video index records provide access to a location for retrieving a video segment.** However, 2:5-2:29 of Corey does not disclose that the query is used to select the category item for the A/V signal **when recording the A/V signal.**

As these technical features are not discussed in Corey, or the secondary reference Chen, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the relied upon references.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7 and 33 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

Claims 11 and 13-17

Claim 11 recites: "…a second storage medium storing category information including the category item for the A/V signal…" The Office Action relies on the closed caption storage 72 of Corey to show this feature of claim 11. However, similar to the argument for claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that in Corey, it is only discussed that the video retrieval index generator 212 partitions the closed caption text received into "meaningful" groups of text and outputs each such group, hereinafter denoted an "index text record" or simply "text record", to a file in the closed caption storage 72 (via data channel 224). It is intended that each index text record contain enough closed caption text describing the video segment from which the closed caption text was obtained so that there is a high probability that the closed caption text can be used to retrieve the video segment. Corey, 6:19-6:31.

Accordingly, the closed caption storage 72 stores all of the closed caption data and only provides an indexing feature so that various A/V signals may be retrieved. Specifically, Corey does not discuss a second storage medium storing **category information** including the category item for the A/V signal.

Claims 11 and 13-17 depend on claim 11 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

Claims 19-22, 24 and 25

Claim 19 recites: "...wherein the selecting unit selects the category item based on a result of comparing feature information of the A/V signal with predetermined category items."

The Office Action rejected claim 19 on the same grounds as claim 1. Similar to the arguments for claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Corey is related to **video programming retrieval**, whereas claim 19 recites an apparatus that **records** an audio/video (A/V) signal. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that neither Corey nor Chen discusses that the A/V signal is recorded based on a result of comparing feature information of the A/V signal with predetermined category items.

Claims 22, 24 and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 20-22, 24 and 25 depend on claim 19 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 20-22, 24 and 25 have been amended to improve the form of the claims.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 18, 2008

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501